

## **REMARKS**

After the foregoing amendment, claims 1-2 and 5-13 are currently pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 4 as well as intervening claim 3. Claims 2, 5, 6 and 9 have been amended to correct minor informalities and provide proper dependencies. Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been introduced into the application by these amendments.

### **Objections to the Specification**

The Action objects to the amendments to the specification as filed in Applicants' August 14, 2008 Reply. Specifically, the Action states that the description of the on page 8, paragraph [0055], introduces new matter into the disclosure because the features recited therein were not identified in Fig. 9 as originally filed.

Applicant's January 26, 2009 Reply included an amended Fig. 9, which was subsequently approved and entered, obviating this rejection. *See* Advisory Action, page 2.

### **Objections to the Claims**

The Action objected to claim 1 as a result of a typographical error. Claim 1 has been amended to correct this deficiency in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the phrase "the force supplying means" in claim 9 lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 10 was likewise rejected for being dependent from indefinite claim 9. By way of this Reply, claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 2, thus providing proper antecedent basis for the limitation "the force supplying means" as recited in claim 9.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 9 and 10 is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 5, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hammerle (U.S. Publication 2001/0019235). Further, claims 1, 2, 5 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,810,045 (Lautenschlager).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 4 and intervening claim 3. Specifically, claim 1 now requires that both the guide and the bottom support bracket comprise serrations engageable when the guide is locked onto the bottom support bracket. As noted in the Action on page 6, none of the references teach or suggest this feature. Thus, claim 1 should now be in a condition for allowance. Claims 2 and 5-13 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and should be similarly patentable. Claim 3 has been canceled, and therefore the rejection to it has been rendered moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of the claims.

**Conclusion**

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1, 2 and 5-13, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lam et al.

By/John L. Janick/  
John L. Janick  
Registration No. 58,306

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

JLJ/djw